

**Medway Council**  
**Meeting of Medway Council**  
**Thursday, 3 March 2011**  
**7.03pm to 9.25pm**

**Record of the meeting**

**Subject to approval as an accurate record at the next Full Council meeting**

**Present:** The Mayor (Councillor Brake)  
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Hewett)  
Councillors Andrews, Avey, Baker, Kenneth Bamber,  
Janice Bamber, Bhutia, Bowler, Brice, Bright, Burt, Carr,  
Rodney Chambers, Mrs Diane Chambers, Chitty, Crack, Doe,  
Etheridge, Gilry, Godwin, Griffin, Griffiths, Harriott, Hicks,  
Hubbard, Jarrett, Jones, Juby, Sheila Kearney,  
Stephen Kearney, Kemp, Mackinlay, Maisey, Maple, Mason,  
O'Brien, Royle, Ruparel, Shaw, Smith, Stamp, Sutton, Wicks  
and Wildey

**In Attendance:** Neil Davies, Chief Executive  
Rose Collinson, Director of Children and Adults  
Robin Cooper, Director of Regeneration, Community and  
Culture  
Mick Hayward, Chief Finance Officer  
Richard Hicks, Assistant Director, Customer First, Leisure,  
Culture, Democracy and Governance  
Julie Keith, Head of Democratic Services  
Caroline Salisbury, Overview and Scrutiny Co-ordinator  
Deborah Upton, Assistant Director, Housing and Corporate  
Services/Monitoring Officer

**826 Record of meeting**

The record of the meeting held on 13 January 2011 was agreed and signed by the Mayor as correct.

**827 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chishti, Clarke, Filmer, Tony Goulden, Val Goulden, Gulvin, Haydock, Hunter and Murray.

**828 Declarations of interest**

Councillor Griffiths declared a personal interest in any discussion that may take place during the course of the meeting with reference to NHS Medway because

## Council, 3 March 2011

he is a Non-Executive Director of the Trust and a Non-Executive Director of Medway Community Healthcare.

Councillor O'Brien declared a personal interest in any discussion that may take place during the course of the meeting with reference to the NHS because some of his family members are employed by the NHS.

### 829 Mayor's announcements

The Mayor informed Members of a number of forthcoming charity events and encouraged them to support them in aid of the Mayor's Charities. These included the Mayor's Ball on 19 March and a theatre night on 6 April 2011.

The Mayor also advised that he had received apologies for absence from Tony Dance, one of the Independent members of the Standards Committee.

### 830 Leader's announcements

There were none.

### 831 Petitions

The following petitions were received and referred to the appropriate Directors:

Councillor Godwin presented a petition with 482 signatures requesting that the Family Services at White Road Community Centre, Chatham are kept open.

Councillor Griffin presented two petitions. The first, with 31 signatures, requested that the current parking restrictions on the left side of Cecil Road, Rochester are lifted between 8am and 6pm on a Saturday. The second petition, containing 60 signatures, requested that traffic calming measures are introduced in Rochester Avenue, Rochester similar to those introduced in King Street, Rochester.

Councillor Jones presented two petitions. The first, with 29 signatures, was from the residents of Granville Road, Cavendish Avenue, Portland Road, Maple Avenue, Oak Avenue and Elm Road in Gillingham requesting the introduction of a local residents' parking scheme in the area. The second petition, also with 29 signatures, was from residents of Camden, Leslie, Shottenden, St. Andrews, Baden and Milner Roads, Gillingham requesting the introduction of a local residents' parking scheme in the area.

### 832 Public questions

**(A) Garry Harrison of Strood asked the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services, Councillor Doe, the following question:**

"What does the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services intend to do to contribute to the success of the Strand, which historically

## Council, 3 March 2011

has been both a key play area for Gillingham and Medway and also a summer destination for families from all of North Kent?"

Councillor Doe responded by thanking Mr Harrison for his question and for his positive comments about the Strand. He stated that the Strand had been a popular facility for some time and the council had carried out a number of modernisations and invested in the region of £180,000 over the past four years for landscape improvements, upgrading swimming facilities, improvements to tennis courts, the miniature railway, play areas, crazy golf and improving the signage. He stated that he believed the site was well managed and maintained but that thought should now be given to the next phase of improvements for the Strand, particularly with regard to flooding which obviously had caused some problems. The Council had been in discussion with the Environment Agency about this and whilst he wanted to retain the essential character of the Strand, there were longer-term works that needed to be done.

Garry Harrison asked a supplementary question as to whether there was a timescale set for each phase of the works?

Councillor Doe responded stating that the major works would not be done before the start of the current season, as they needed to be planned. He advised that a variety of methods of funding were being investigated, as there was unprecedented pressure on Council capital funds and a number of other options were being considered, such as land raising which showed the council's commitment to the area. He hoped there should be significant change between the end of this season and the start of the next but it may be that it would have to be delivered over a two year period as it depended on the availability of funds.

**(B) Danielle Amusa of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services, Councillor Wicks, the following question:**

"Our services at the White Road Family Centre receive an annual budget of £1000. If the services were to close, has Medway Council considered the additional costs and the impact it will have on the local community?"

Councillor Wicks thanked Ms Amusa for her question and stated that the £1000 budget, which came from revenue funding held by All Saints Sure Start Children's Centre to support parenting and family support activities at the White Road Community Centre, had not been cut.

The Portfolio Holder for Children's Services stated that the suggestion that the White Road Community Centre was to close could not be further from the truth, although a lot of people were being led to believe otherwise. Medway Council had recently invested and refurbished the centre, as part of a social regeneration project to transform it into a community hub and use of the centre had increased. It now hosted a number of courses, clubs and support services which were well regarded

## Council, 3 March 2011

and well used by the local community. This included health visitors, a pre-school, family surgeries, dance sessions and a judo club. There were also new initiatives that were being developing to improve this offer in the future.

Councillor Wicks advised that the Council had to routinely monitor and review how funding was being used to ensure that services were being delivered effectively and this process had been misinterpreted as an intention to cut services. He stated that no such decision had been made.

Ms. Amusa stated that she wished to clarify that she was talking about the White Road Family Centre Services not the actual Community Centre and the White Road Centre itself.

Councillor Wicks agreed that the Family Centre at White Road was part of the community facility and it was run as a subsidiary of the All Saints Sure Start Centre.

**(C) Kelly O'Connell of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services, Councillor Wicks, the following question:**

"If under the Early Years spending review there is to be no more White Road Family Centre, what is the local authority's plan for the many isolated families who fully engage in this service but who cannot and will not access other services in the local area?"

Councillor Wicks responded that the suggestion that White Road Community Centre was to close was untrue. Medway Council had recently invested and refurbished the centre, as part of a social regeneration project to transform it and it was now a community hub, and use of the centre had increased. It now hosted a number of courses, clubs and support services which were well-regarded and well used by the local community. This included health visitors, a pre-school, family surgeries, dance sessions and a judo club. There were also new initiatives coming.

Kelly O'Connell did not ask a supplementary question.

**(D) Denise Cole of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services, Councillor Wicks, the following question:**

"What are going to be the benefits of closing the Family Services when it is a service for 0-90 year olds and there are no other organisations that support the age groups mentioned?"

Councillor Wicks thanked Denise Cole for the question and stated that the suggestion that the White Road Community Centre was to close could not be further from the truth. The White Road Community Centre housed a wide range of services and in addition to Sure Start, which

## Council, 3 March 2011

supported families with babies and children under the age of five, it also supported children and young people and adults. He hoped the information he had given could be taken back by the questioners to the people who felt threatened unnecessarily about the future of the centre.

Ms Cole stated that the Family Service rooms were based in the Community Centre but were not part of the actual services run in the Community. She asked how the community would be affected without these services and what would the Portfolio Holder be able to replace these with?

Councillor Wicks stated that as far as he was concerned the future of the centre was assured. He did not think the customers of White Road had any need to fear. He would like his positive comments to be taken back to people who use the centre.

**(E) Tony Jeacock of Rainham asked the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Jarrett, the following question:**

“Is the Portfolio Holder aware of the status of the clock on the Will Adams monument in Watling Street?”

Councillor Jarrett thanked Mr Jeacock for his question and stated that he understood that there had been various problems with the clock over the past months. There had been a problem with the power supply which was now repaired and hopefully it would stay in working order. He would get periodic updates to make sure that happened.

Mr Jeacock thanked Councillor Jarrett for his answer and asked, given that the Will Adams Shogun connection linking Gillingham with Japan was held in such high esteem, what provision did the Portfolio holder propose putting in place with regard to car parking facilities for tourists and visitors wishing to see the monument and who hopefully would bring some additional revenue to the Watling Street shops and other amenities?

Councillor Jarrett replied that there were no plans to put such car parking facilities in place and he believed that there was adequate car parking already in the locality. He stated that the increased revenue streams that may be forthcoming would certainly be outweighed by the provision of expensive parking. If in the future such provision was necessary then he would look at that again. In the meantime he would keep the matter under review.

**(F) Bryan Fowler of Chatham asked the Chairman of the Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Bright, the following question:**

“At the Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 29 September 2010, which you chaired, you opposed the

## Council, 3 March 2011

request of my Ward Councillor and your fellow Committee Member, that the Committee write to the owners of the Pentagon Centre about the matter of the refurbishment of the Shopping Centre toilets for which a public grant of over £200,000 was made.

The Pentagon Shopping Centre management did not replace the old, cracked wash basins and have levied a charge of 20p for each shopper using them.

Could you as, Chairman of this Committee, state why you opposed this request?"

Councillor Bright thanked Mr Fowler for his question and advised that due to the nature of the question being the same as the one previously asked at the Full Council on 13 January 2011 but slightly reworded he could only refer Mr Fowler back to the answer previously given.

Brian Fowler asked a supplementary question, agreeing that the question was phrased differently but that Councillor Bright had evaded the question. He asked if Councillor Bright considered whether his response was a perversion of the course of democratic government?

Councillor Bright responded that he had answered the question at the previous meeting on 13 January 2011. He stated that this was the fourth time that Mr Fowler had asked this question at Full Council. The first question being to the Leader on 14 October 2010, the second question on 25 November 2010 to himself, which was withdrawn because he was away on holiday, the third question on 13 January 2011 and this being the fourth question.

**(G) Peter Cole of Chatham asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, the following question:**

"Government guidance published in 2007 covering the closure of schools clearly states that when disposing of any associated playing field evidence must be provided to the Secretary of State that there is no longer a need by other schools and that the needs of the local schools, particularly those sharing a campus or boundary with the closed school, have been taken fully into account.

Although this should have already been done by the relevant Portfolio Holder before the Cabinet agreed to dispose of the land (Cabinet Decision Number 2/2011) this is clearly not the case as I have actually taken the time to consult the two schools concerned (Greenacre and Bradfields Schools) and I can state they have not been consulted or even informed that the playing fields connected to the Ridge Meadow Site are to be disposed of. Both schools indicated that they would welcome the additional space and the associated revenue stream it could bring.

## Council, 3 March 2011

Is this not a simple failure by both the Portfolio Holder and more widely Medway Council's Cabinet to follow strict criteria and bring into the question the robustness of the decision taken by Cabinet on January 18 this year?"

Councillor Rodney Chambers responded that in January 2011 the Cabinet took the decision to declare the Ridge Meadow site surplus to requirements. The Cabinet Members were advised, at paragraph 7.2 of that report, "that the Council needed to secure consent from the Department of Education before it could dispose of the Ridge Meadow site". This was the procedure that the Council would have followed. However, before that consent was sought a review was undertaken, the result of which was that the Council had now taken the decision to create a specialist Autism Unit along with a post-16 Bradfields Unit and those units would now share the Ridge Meadow site. A report on these proposed new uses for the site would be submitted to the Cabinet in due course.

Mr Cole commented that the same government guidance went on to lay down criteria for the community use of such playing fields. He stated that he had evidence that a local girls' football team, Meridian girls, had been displaced into Aylesford to play their home games even though they had, and more importantly still wished to, use the playing field on the Ridge Meadow site. This therefore highlighted another clear failure on both service directorates and the relevant Portfolio Holder before the site was declared surplus. He asked who was willing to accept both responsibility and accountability for this glaring error?

Councillor Rodney Chambers responded that he was convinced that the Council and the Cabinet went through the correct procedures.

**(H) Mr Cole, on behalf of his wife, Wendy Cole of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services, Councillor Doe, the following question:**

"Medway Council made a statement to the Medway Urban Parks and Green Spaces August Forum that it was "fully committed to retaining and improving its open space" (Councillor Doe, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services). Why then, as Portfolio Holder, did he raise no objection to the disposal of the playing field, associated open space and woodland at the Ridge Meadow Site as detailed in the Property Disposals document to Cabinet of 18 January 2011 (paragraph 6.1)?"

Councillor Doe thanked Mr Cole for his question advising that as he had said at the forum, the Council was fully committed to the principle of retaining and improving its open spaces and he was, of course, referring to those public open spaces that the council had. The Ridge Meadow site was education land and the reason he did not object to declaring the Ridge Meadow site surplus was because it was surplus to educational requirements. He stated that the Council had now taken the decision to

## Council, 3 March 2011

create a specialist autism unit along with the post-16 Bradfields Unit on the Ridge Meadow site.

Mr Cole asked a supplementary question and advised that although the decision to create a new Autism Unit was welcomed, it had not clarified the situation with regard to the adjacent area of open fields and woodland. He referred to the same Green Spaces Forum meeting that Councillor Doe had highlighted and was quoted as saying 'Medway Council needed to announce and communicate better with members of the public.' He asked if Councillor Doe would publicly declare that the open space would not be disposed of and allay fears that this decision, unlike the announcement of the good news of the autism unit, had been shelved to avoid any political damage it may cause in the forthcoming local elections?

Councillor Doe responded that as far as he knew there was no intention to sell off that part of the land and he thought that the eventual use of that, whatever form of public use it might take, was not something on which he could take a prior view until he saw what proposals came forward.

**I) Tristan Osborne of Rochester submitted to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer, the following question:**

"Given the announcement in the budget of increasing revenues from enforcement penalties, can the Portfolio Holder give a firm commitment to a full, transparent and immediate operational review of the CCTV car fleet given recent press and public commentary that indicates the public consider it unfair that the car can break the highway code to enforce the law?"

Councillor Jarrett, Portfolio Holder for Finance, explained that as Councillor Filmer was unable to attend the meeting, he would respond to the question on Councillor Filmer's behalf. He thanked Mr Osborne for the question and advised that there were already very clear rules governing the use of CCTV cars. The cars were authorised and approved to be used under the Traffic Management Act 2004 for the enforcement of parking and loading restrictions. He stated that the use of such vehicles was clearly documented and governed by regulations and as such Medway operated these vehicles in accordance with these regulations. The cars had been welcomed by many residents in Medway and had a positive impact on road safety especially outside of schools. He reported that 79% of residents in Medway believed that it was important for the Council to enforce the parking restrictions in this way to continue to improve road safety.

Mr Osborne commented that the public did not support a vehicle that broke the same laws that it imposed on everyone else but might support the enforcement element to it. Given the speculation amongst the public



## Council, 3 March 2011

at the present time, he asked if there any plans to increase the number of vehicles from the present two over the next four years?

Councillor Jarrett stated that budgeting in Medway was carried out on an annual basis notwithstanding the fact that it had a Medium Term Financial Plan. This year's budget was for two CCTV cars and he had no reason to believe that this number would be added to in future years but of course when the new administration reviews that during the next budget setting round it might take a different view. However he had been assured by Councillor Filmer and officers that that type of enforcement provision was adequate for Medway's needs.

**(J) Bryan Fowler of Chatham asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, the following question:**

“What function will the Pentagon Shopping Centre have as regards the holding or parking of buses when the new bus station is eventually opened on Chatham's Waterfront? For clarity: I mean the whole of the Pentagon Centre including its current bus station and parking areas.”

Councillor Rodney Chambers advised that it was not proposed to use the Pentagon shopping centre including its current bus station and parking areas for the holding or parking of buses when the new Chatham Waterfront bus station opened this summer.

Mr Fowler asked a supplementary question, asking the Leader whether he thought the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for regeneration could have scrutinised the decisions about the bus station rather than refusing to call-in the Cabinet decisions?

Councillor Rodney Chambers replied that he knew that the Scrutiny Committee had examined the plans for the bus station, and that this type of decision was for the Scrutiny Committee when it decided its work programme.

**(K) Tristan Osborne of Rochester asked the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Jarrett, the following question:**

“Can I ask the Portfolio Holder what consultation efforts have been made to the public in the surrounding area of the former Ridge Meadow Primary School on the proposed sell-off of the land. Given we have heard many statements of opposition on development on nearby Capstone, does this potential land sell, which is opposed in the community, represent a change in policy for this administration?”

Councillor Jarrett responded by referring to the responses from both the Leader and Councillor Doe on this matter earlier this evening. The land was not, or any part of the Ridge Meadow site was not going to be sold off but would be retained for educational purposes as outlined. The current administration had maintained a clear policy on protecting green

## **Council, 3 March 2011**

spaces and had successfully fought plans to develop Capstone Valley even though the previous government had forced the Council to consult on housing development in that area under its Local Development Framework process. The Council would continue to fight any proposals to develop such areas as it had done in the past.

Mr Osborne advised that he had submitted his question before the announcement last Thursday. Many in the community did not feel that this had been well consulted upon and he thought some of the questions tonight had indicated that. He asked if he could get a guarantee that even with the new announcements there would be no land sell off in any proportion of the land or any surplus part of the land would be considered for sell off and it would only remain in use for education?

Councillor Jarrett responded that the Cabinet had declared the Ridge Meadow site surplus to the Council's requirements and that was the whole of the Ridge Meadow site including the playing fields, which had been alluded to earlier in the evening. Council had asked Cabinet to review that decision. Cabinet would be reviewing that decision at the earliest opportunity and he would be urging his colleagues to reverse the decision which would mean that all of the Ridge Meadow site would be declared surplus. He hoped that the decision would be reversed, and all of the land - both the school buildings and the site on which they stood and the associated green spaces would be retained for educational purposes.

### **833 Leader's report**

#### **Discussion:**

Members received and debated the Leader's report, which included the following:

- HMS Chatham
- Community hubs
- Recent inspection of Children's Services
- Cross-party tributes to Bob Wade, Community Engagement Officer who died recently.

### **834 Overview and scrutiny activity**

#### **Discussion:**

Members received a report on Overview and Scrutiny activities. The following issues were discussed during the debate:

- Out of area provision of Special Educational Needs services
- Changes to the Phlebotomy service
- School admissions
- Empty properties

## Council, 3 March 2011

- Disabled adaptation grants.

The report included details of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and the proposal that the review and scrutiny of flood and risk management be added to the terms of reference of the Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Kenneth Bamber, supported by Councillor Wildey, proposed the recommendation set out in the report.

### **Decision:**

The Council agreed to add the responsibility for the review and scrutiny of flood and coastal erosion risk management functions under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to the Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee's terms of reference.

### **835 Members' questions**

#### **(A) Councillor Bhutia asked the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Enforcement, Councillor O'Brien, the following question:**

"How successful have Partners and Communities Together (PACTs) been in improving the engagement between residents and the Council and partner agencies?"

Councillor O'Brien responded that PACTs sat alongside a number of other community engagement tools used by the Community Safety Partnership and had been a huge success in Medway. There were now over 20 PACTs actively running across the authority. Some had been set up to deal with specific issues and had ceased to be active once those areas of community concern had been dealt with. Others had grown and evolved and become a real hub of community focus and interest, such as the Gillingham Green PACT which had recently carried out an environmental check of the area and identified an area near Layfield Road that would benefit from a waste bin, which had since been installed.

Councillor O'Brien stated that Community Officers attended each PACT together with representatives from Medway Police. They listened to residents' concerns and arranged for any issues to be dealt with swiftly. The recent PACT Task Group had been charged with assessing the effectiveness and future of PACTs in Medway and had confirmed that PACTs were a good way of bringing residents together to develop priorities and action plans at neighbourhood level alongside other opportunities for community engagement currently on offer. He advised that the review document had been welcomed by the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) which was looking to support and engage even more closely with Medway's PACTs to ensure their future success. He also reported the launch of the first marine PACT at Gillingham Marina. The first meeting had been well supported by the marine community and with a steering group in place he was certain it would go from strength to strength.

## Council, 3 March 2011

Councillor Bhutia asked a supplementary question of Councillor O'Brien to find out how he was working to engage young people in community safety?

Councillor O'Brien replied that it was the perceived poor behaviour of young people that had emerged as a common theme amongst PACTs. However, there was a lack of young people that took part in the PACT process and the challenge had been how to bring children, the schools they attended and the surrounding community closer together. He stated that two secondary schools had recently experimented with a new style forum to achieve this. The Schools and Community Together Committee (SACT) brought together pupils from all year groups to discuss community projects and to learn about the impact of graffiti, litter and other forms of anti-social behaviour to raise the profile of the school and community and to maintain the trust of its neighbours. The idea was to embed its ethos into the daily routine of every pupil through pastoral lessons and regular assemblies. The chairs of each SACT would also attend the local PACT meetings. Both schools were also looking into setting up pupil-led computer classes for senior citizens, tea dances and a community sow and grow gardening scheme. He advised that pupils were identifying the same problems and perceptions as the older population. The vast majority of young people were decent, law abiding individuals who wanted many, if not all of the basic things: to live safely in a clean environment; to have a voice; and to feel that they could make a positive difference. Councillor O'Brien stated that he hoped that schools across Medway would embrace this new initiative.

**(B) Councillor Juby asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, the following question:**

"In these times of financial stringency when is Councillor Chambers going to look at the size of the Cabinet?"

Councillor Rodney Chambers replied that the size of the Cabinet and the responsibilities of the Portfolio Holders were always under consideration and any changes that may be proposed would be brought forward to a future annual meeting of Medway Council.

Councillor Juby did not ask a supplementary question but stated that he looked forward to the changes that any new Leader of this Council would carry out in May, as he thought the Cabinet size needed to be reduced in line with the reduction in the number of staff in the Council.

**(C) Councillor Maple asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, the following question:**

"Following my previous question on 13 January, could the Leader of the Council provide an update on the 'extensive discussions' from week commencing 17 January regarding funding arrangements for the Chatham Dynamic Bus Facility?"

## Council, 3 March 2011

Councillor Rodney Chambers advised that he had personally met with the Thames Gateway Minister Bob Neill, MP who had assured him that he would assist with unblocking any issues around funding for the bus facility. He advised that the bus facility was still on track for opening around the first week of June, as reported to the cross party Chatham Board on several occasions. It was also still on budget and there was no overspend or underspend anticipated on the project. Senior officers were also in regular close dialogue with the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA).

Councillor Maple thanked Councillor Chambers for his answer. He referred to the supplementary question that he had asked on 13 January 2011 which was around a firm commitment on the funding being available after 31 March 2011. He asked again whether there would be a specific update on the funding continuing to be available from the HCA following 31 March?

Councillor Rodney Chambers replied that he had no reason to believe that more funding from the HCA would not be forthcoming.

### **836 Local Transport 3 (Policy Framework)**

#### **Discussion:**

This report sought Council approval to the amended statutory Local Transport Plan (2011 – 2026) following public consultation on the provisional plan, as part of the Council's Policy Framework.

Councillor Chitty, supported by Councillor Jarrett, proposed the recommendations set out in the report.

#### **Decision:**

The Council agreed to adopt the revised Local Transport Plan (LTP) 3 Transport Strategy detailed at Appendix 5 of the report.

### **837 Disposal of Queen's Court, Rainham**

#### **Discussion:**

This report sought Council approval to declare the Queen's Court site, Rainham surplus, so that it could be disposed of at best consideration. The site had previously been declared surplus with conditions to ensure the development of affordable supported housing. Following the unsuccessful marketing of the site and on the basis that it was no longer required by Adult Social Care for supported living, it was proposed to sell the site without the previous conditions attached.

Councillor Jarrett, supported by Councillor Mason, proposed the recommendations set out in the report.

#### **Decision:**

## **Council, 3 March 2011**

The Council declared the Queen's Court site surplus and delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Housing and Corporate Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance, to sell the property at best consideration and that this authority supercedes the previous authority delegated on 5 March 2009.

### **838 Special Urgency Decisions**

#### **Discussion:**

This report detailed a decision taken by the Cabinet under the special urgency provisions contained within the Constitution on proposed staffing reductions.

#### **Decision:**

The Council noted the report.

### **839 Motions**

There were none.

**Mayor**

**Date:**

**Julie Keith, Head of Democratic Services**

Telephone: 01634 332760

Email: [democratic.services@medway.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@medway.gov.uk)